

**From:** markdoerr@mac.com@inetgw  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 11/20/01 7:34pm

To Whom it May Concern:

The pattern of behavior that Microsoft has exhibited over the past 10-15 years shows a disturbing trend to monopolistic practices, as borne out in the recent judgement against them in your anti-trust lawsuit. I am disgusted that you now bow to their lobbying efforts and back away from the Justice Department's hard-fought anti-trust victory.

Didn't the previous consent agreement contain provisions for curbing Microsoft's business practices? Didn't Microsoft agree to that settlement only when faced with an anti-trust lawsuit? Weren't they finally sued because they did not honor that agreement? Although the remedy was thrown out, were the findings in that anti-trust case not upheld?

The argument could be made that they offer much of their software for free and how that is a benefit to the consumer. But that is the short term view they want you to take. Like a drug dealer, they hook you with seemingly negligible restrictions, an unending supply of goodies and once hooked, are able to control your access to them and how you use them. For a hefty fee, of course. It's insidious. They used the Internet Explorer browser to foil any attempt at loosening their grip on operating systems, by offering it freely and undermining companies that did not have the luxury of OS earnings to fall back on. They have done it many times and will continue to do this until there are no credible alternatives rather than the 2 or 3 that now exist. At least in the server market. There are none for consumers. The news today shows that Palm is losing market share to Microsoft and their Palm PC OS devices. Palm is yet another example of a company who started with a superior product and over 80% market share yet will slowly have their cash position and market share eroded by the slow, unending crawl of Microsoft's corporate weight.

It is the lowest form of self-delusion to think that Microsoft won't treat your proposed settlement any differently than the one they previous ignored. It's also insulting to taxpayers to think we don't see that you are pandering to the interests of one of the largest and most aggressive companies on the face of the earth rather than doing your job to protect the interests of the American consumer. We're smarter than that. I had hoped those who protect our interests were but I find I am sorely

mistaken.

Mark Doerr

Los Angeles, CA